

OPINION 901

RICHARDSON FISH NAMES: SUPPRESSED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING—(1) Under the plenary powers the following specific names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

- (a) *isingleena* Richardson, 1846, as published in the binomen *Clupea isingleena*;
- (b) *nymphaea* Richardson, 1846, as published in the binomen *Clupea nymphaea*;
- (c) *caeruleovittata* Richardson, 1846, as published in the binomen *Clupea caeruleovittata*;
- (d) *clathrata* Richardson, 1844, as published in the binomen *Anguilla clathrata*;
- (e) *flos-maris* Richardson, 1846, as published in the binomen *Clupea flos-maris*.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology, with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *isingleena* Richardson, 1846, as published in the binomen *Clupea isingleena* (Name No. 916);
- (b) *nymphaea* Richardson, 1846, as published in the binomen *Clupea nymphaea* (Name No. 917);
- (c) *caeruleovittata* Richardson, 1846, as published in the binomen *Clupea caeruleovittata* (Name No. 918);
- (d) *clathrata* Richardson, 1844, as published in the binomen *Anguilla clathrata* (Name No. 919);
- (e) *flos-maris* Richardson, 1846, as published in the binomen *Clupea flos-maris* (Name No. 920).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *fibriata* Valenciennes, 1847, as published in the binomen *Spratella fibriata* (Name No. 2355);
- (b) *aurita* Valenciennes, 1847, as published in the binomen *Sardinella aurita* (Name No. 2356);
- (c) *leiogaster* Valenciennes, 1847, as published in the binomen *Sardinella leiogaster* (Name No. 2357);
- (d) *japonica* Temminck & Schlegel, 1846, as published in the binomen *Anguilla japonica* (Name No. 2358);
- (e) *acuta* Valenciennes, 1847, as published in the binomen *Dussumieria acuta* (Name No. 2359).

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1740)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission in February 1966 by Mr. P. J. P. Whitehead. The application was sent to the printer on 28 February 1966 and was published on 29 April 1966 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **23** : 62–64. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the prescribed serial publications (Constitution, Art. 12b; *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **21** : 184) and to one specialist serial. A comment in favour of the application was received from W. L. Chan, who proposed the suppression of a further Richardson name (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **23** : 146–148). A comment supporting the application was also received from the nomenclature committee of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 27 February 1969 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (68)6 either for or against the proposal as set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **23** : 63–64. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 27 May 1968 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—twenty-four (24), received in the following order: China, Holthuis, Melville, Mayr, Vokes, Boschma, Jaczewski, Obruchev, Munroe, Brinck, Sabrosky, Lemche, Starobogatov, Uchida, Alvarado, Eisenmann, Tortonese, Binder, Evans, Simpson, Kraus, Bonnet, Mertens, Ride.*

Negative votes—none (0).

Voting Papers not returned—two (2): do Amaral, Forest.

In returning his Voting Paper, Commissioner Ride made the following comment: "I reserve decision in the case of *C. nymphaea*. The applicant states that this name has been consistently misapplied for well over 50 years. What now happens to the name of the species to which it has been constantly applied? Should not *nymphaea* be conserved and attached to that species in order to maintain stability? Unfortunately the application contains inadequate information to enable us to decide.

"My indecision results from Whitehead's statement that the species to which this name has been constantly misapplied for over 50 years has been associated with this name through the characters of its formerly-supposed type (BMNH. 1963.6.17.1); yet he also states that the specimen is now identified as *Sardinella fimbriata* (Valenciennes) 'a common Indo-Pacific species frequently cited in the literature.'—are both names in use for this species; is *fimbriata* the best name to use for it or should we conserve *nymphaea*? Or has BMNH. 1963.6.17.1 been misassociated with yet another kind of fish?"

In answer to Dr. Ride, Mr. Whitehead writes:

"Using Richardson's rather poor description, together with the type of *Clupea isingleena* Richardson, authors have used the name *nymphaea* as a senior synonym in the genus *Harengula* Val. (= *Herklotsichthys* Whitley), e.g. Rutter (1897, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* : 63), Regan (1917, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (8) **19** : 392), Fowler (1930, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* : 598; 1941,

* In part only, see comment.

Bull. U.S. natl. Mus. (100) **13** : 599) and Chu & Tsai (1958, *Quart. J. Taiwan Mus.* **11** (1-2) : 115). The other specimens that these authors identified with *nymphaea* have not been examined by me but the descriptions suggest that species of both *Herklotsichthys* and *Sardinella* were involved. Chan (1965, *Jap. J. Ichthyol.*, **13** (1-3) : 22) was the first to doubt the authenticity of the type specimen attributed to *nymphaea*; he lacked specimens but placed the species as a senior synonym in *Sardinella*. Whitehead (1966, *Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist. (Zool.)* **14** (2) : 24) showed that *nymphaea* was, in fact a senior synonym of *Sardinella aurita* Valenciennes, 1847 and that the 'type' of *nymphaea* was actually the type of *Clupea isingleena* Richardson and could be identified as *Sardinella fimbriata* Valenciennes, 1847. Since no previous author had identified *nymphaea* (or its supposed type) with *Sardinella fimbriata*, a simple transference of the name *nymphaea* to become a senior synonym of *fimbriata* would have confounded the existing confusion, the more so since *fimbriata* has been commonly used as a senior synonym, has a reasonably good description and possesses five syntypes."

Through an oversight the fifth Richardson name, the suppression of which was proposed by W. L. Chan in a comment on the original application was omitted from Voting Paper (69)13. Consequently, on 5 February 1969 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote on Voting Paper (69)13 under the Three-Month Rule, either for or against the proposal as set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **23** : 147-148. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 5 May 1969 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—twenty-three (23), received in the following order: China, Holthuis, Mayr, Vokes, Simpson, Eisenmann, Lemche, Munroe, Obruchev, Melville, Bonnet, Mertens, Kraus, Alvarado, Jaczewski, Sabrosky, Starobogatov, Uchida, do Amaral, Evans, Binder, Tortonese, Forest.

Negative votes—none (0).

Voting Paper not returned—one (1): Ride.

Commissioner Brinck returned a late affirmative vote.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on the Official List and Index by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

acuta, *Dussumieria*, Valenciennes, 1847, in Cuvier & Valenciennes, *Hist. nat.*

Poiss. **20** : 467

aurita *Sardinella*, Valenciennes, 1847, in Cuvier & Valenciennes, *Hist. nat.*

Poiss. **20** : 263

caeruleovittata, *Clupea*, Richardson, 1846, *15th. Rept. Brit. Assoc. (Cambr. 1845)* : 305

clathrata, *Anguilla*, Richardson, 1844, *Zool. Voy. "Sulphur"* **1** : 104

fimbriata, *Spratella*, Valenciennes, 1847, in Cuvier & Valenciennes, *Hist. nat.*

Poiss. **20** : 359

flos-maris, *Clupea*, Richardson, 1846, *15th. Rept. Brit. Assoc. (Cambr. 1845)* : 305

isingleena, *Clupea*, Richardson, 1846, *15th. Rept. Brit. Assoc. (Cambr. 1845)* :

304

- japonica*, *Anguilla*, Temminck & Schegel, 1846, in Siebold, *Fauna japon* (Pisc.) :
258
leiogaster, *Sardinella*, Valenciennes, 1847, in Cuvier & Valenciennes, *Hist. nat.*
Poiss. 20 : 270
nymphaea, *Clupea*, Richardson, 1846, 15th. *Rept. Brit. Assoc.* (Cambr. 1845) :
304

CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Papers (68)6 and (69)13 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in those Voting Papers have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 901.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

W. E. CHINA
Assistant Secretary
London,
17 June 1969